



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EBERNAND VON ERFURT AND THE *VITA HEINRICI*.

Ever since the appearance of Bechstein's edition of the only poem by Ebernand von Erfurt, the so-called *Heinrich und Kunegunde*,¹ it has been known that one of the sources of the poem was some manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi*.² Bechstein could not state, however, which manuscript this was nor did he venture any theory on the question. He merely drew attention to a few passages in the poem which led him to think that the poet's source was not an exact copy of the standard *Vita*.³ It is possible, I think, to eliminate much of the doubt regarding the manuscript by reviewing the passages cited by Bechstein and by a consideration of several others which he did not notice. One of the latter is very remarkable as it presents a contradiction which is perhaps unique in literature.

The lines of the poem which are chiefly involved are 2175-2327 and contain a description of Heinrich's death. However, as some of these lines correspond closely to a paragraph in the standard *Vita*,⁴ a portion of 2175-2327 may be left out of the

¹ Herausgegeben von Reinhold Bechstein. Quedlinburg und Leipzig. 1860. In the following pages I always refer to this edition when quoting Bechstein; the citation of lines in the poem also follows his edition, the only one yet published.

² To be found in the Monum. germ. hist. VI. script. IV. pagg. 792-814. (Cited below throughout as "Monum".)

³ P. II.

⁴ These lines are the following: 2214-2235, 2251-60, 2280-94, and 2311-23. The paragraph in the *Vita* is as follows: (Monum. p. 810, 27-37) Denique consummatis gloriosissimae huius vitae laboribus, postquam bonae opinionis odorem longe lateque redolere fecerat, locumque sibi dilectum cum caeteris monasteriis ditando et ornando et excolendo ad perfectum advexerat, ad percipiendam inmarcescibilem coronam ab ergastulo carnis a Domino evocatus est. Qui cum cerneret imminere sibi mortis diem, citatis ad se parentibus et cognatis beatissimae imperatricis Chunegundae, nonnullis etiam regni primoribus, manu eam apprehensam, commendavit illis huiusmodi verbis memoria dignis: *Hanc ecce, inquit, mihi a vobis, immo per Christum consignatam, qui Christo domino nostro et vobis resigno virginem vestram.* In ejus vero

present discussion and I can limit myself to certain sub-passages which are not based on the standard *Vita*. After a consideration of these I shall take up all the other passages in the poem which bear upon the question in point. The cumulative evidence of all these passages, especially of those within the lines 2175-2327, indicates, I think, the manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi* which Ebernand used.

Bechstein calls attention to one passage within the lines 2175-2327 which deviates from the standard *Vita*, but I think he draws a wrong conclusion from it. Ebernand tells in the lines 2295-2310 a story about the appearance of a devil to Heinrich on his deathbed and begins it with the words: *noch hörte ich sagen ein mêre*. Bechstein questions the truth of the poet's assertion that he followed oral tradition only for these lines.⁵ But when Ebernand says that another story of much greater length and far more significance was told to him by a friend,⁶ Bechstein believes him and bases a considerable part of his discussion of the poet's life on bits of information that come out in connection with this story.⁷ This position I do not consider tenable. *Noch hörte ich sagen ein mêre* might indeed be interpreted as a meaningless formula, such formulae were of course common in Middle-High German literature, but the significance to be attached to them must be determined by the usage and credibility of each individual poet. Ebernand is not careless or misleading in his use of such references to sources. Of his references to written sources it can be proved that a large majority of the passages so ascribed arose just as he claims. Of the small minority this cannot be proved, as the manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi* which Ebernand used is not at hand, but it cannot be

transsitu, terra plorante, coelum exultavit, sicut Dominus per suam misericordiam revelare dignatus est. Sub ipsa etenim hora exitus illius cuidam servo Dei in solitudine commoranti diabolus sub humana specie traditur apparuisse.

⁵ P. II.

⁶ Cf. 4095-4300 for the story, and especially 4115 sqq. for the origin of it.

⁷ P. I sq. and p. V.

proved either that they did not arise as he says. It cannot be proved that Ebernand falsified the origin, written or oral, of any passage in the poem. The lines 2295-2310 probably are based on oral tradition, therefore, because Ebernand says so, and because there is absolutely no evidence to the contrary.

Of the remaining lines of the whole passage 2175-2327 some are based on the *Vita Heinrici* as given in the Monum.,⁸ and some are not. By his table of correspondences between the lines of the poem and the Monum.⁹ Bechstein leads the reader to believe that the whole passage 2175-2327 with the single exception of the lines 2295-2310 is based on the given text. Harry Bresslau demurs to this to the extent of 2324-7, but he too does not notice a much more remarkable divergence of the poem from the present *Vita Heinrici*.¹⁰ I shall now consider in turn all the sub-passages in 2175-2327 (except the one treated in the preceding paragraph, 2295-2310) which are independent of the source cited.¹¹

The first sub-passages, 2175-2213, is a didactic introduction to the description of Heinrich's death. The next longest didactic passage in the poem which is original with the poet as compared with the present source, is contained in 265-76; I am in doubt whether this was original with the poet or not. But granting that he invented the whole of it, the passage 265-76 is a matter of twelve lines, and 2175-2213 contains thirty-nine lines. If the passage 2175-2213 is to be ascribed solely to the invention of the poet, it must be done, therefore, with the admission that it is the only really long, wholly original, didactic interpolation which Ebernand permitted himself to make in his use of the *Vita Heinrici*. I incline to think that it was at least suggested in the manuscript of the *Vita* which Ebernand used.

⁸Cf. above n. 4.

⁹ P. III sq., especially under Abschnitt XXXII-XXXIV.

¹⁰ *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II.* Bd. III. Leipzig. Duncker und Humblot. 1875. p. 369.

¹¹ Their independence of this source can be easily verified by a comparison of them with the Latin given above, n. 4.

The second sub-passage 2236-50 is the most remarkable as it contradicts an important statement about the place of Heinrich's burial not three hundred lines farther on.

Cf. 2236-50:	and 2507-13:
<i>der fursten in dem riche</i>	<i>dô solde man den werden</i>
<i>hâte er (i. e. Heinrich)</i>	<i>bestaten zuo der erden,</i>
<i>harte vil besant</i>	<i>ze Babenberc wart er dô</i>
<i>ze Merseburg in Saksen-</i>	<i>brâht:</i>
<i>lant.</i>	2510 <i>daz hâte er selbe vor be-</i>
<i>dâr lac der hêre guote:</i>	<i>dâht,</i>
2240 <i>daz was ime ze muote,</i>	<i>daz er dâr ligen wolde.</i>
<i>daz er ruowen wolde dâ</i>	<i>dô wart der gotes holde</i>
<i>und ouch niergen ander-</i>	<i>harte keiserlich begraben.</i>
<i>swâ,</i>	
<i>wan diz daz êrste bistuom</i>	
<i>was,</i>	
<i>alse ich û ze vorderst las,</i>	
2245 <i>daz er wider hâte brâht.</i>	
<i>nû was er des ouch wol</i>	
<i>bedâht,</i>	
<i>er wolde zuo den zîten</i>	
<i>endes aldâr bîten,</i>	
<i>genâde er sich wol ver-</i>	
<i>sach,</i>	
<i>vil volliclich die ime ge-</i>	
<i>schach.</i>	

In other words Ebernand seems to overlook or to forget the order in which he has told of the restoration of Merseburg and other bishoprics; Merseburg was not the first bishopric which Heinrich restored according to Ebernand's account, cf. 321 sqq. More remarkable still, Ebernand buries Heinrich in two places. In the one passage he distinctly says that Heinrich was buried in Bamberg, and in the other he leads the reader unmistakably to infer that Heinrich was buried in Merseburg. Besides this he states positively that Merseburg was the scene of Heinrich's

death. Ebernand makes no explanation of the two contradictions, apparently because he is quite unconscious of them.

The passage must, I think, be ascribed to a written source. The poet does not ascribe it to oral tradition, and this fact is an indication of written authority for it, as Ebernand seems very zealous throughout the poem in emphasizing the fact when he deviates from that which was written.¹² As Bechstein has already shown,¹³ Ebernand's dependence upon the *Vita Heinrichi* is distinctly slavish. Except in the lines 2175-2327 and 2025-54, that is, in over 1700 lines he never deviates from this *Vita* in matters of fact concerning Heinrich, he adds nothing and omits nothing. It seems very improbable to me, therefore, that Ebernand would enlarge upon matters of fact in the lines just cited, and only in these. That Ebernand knew that Heinrich was buried in Bamberg, is substantiated by 3902-3 and 4475-7. Besides, it is certain that Ebernand was at some time in Bamberg before writing his poem,¹⁴ and he must have seen Heinrich's tomb there. If Ebernand had had any particular interest in Merseburg, it might have led him to insert the passage 2236-50 contrary to the usual version of the *Vita Heinrichi*, but I have found nothing but this passage which would seem to establish any connection whatever between Ebernand and Merseburg. All the other references to the latter in the poem can be found to be based directly on the *Vita Heinrichi* as it is in the Monum., that is, on the standard version. A passage like this which adds positive statements of fact and which denies the truth of statements which we know the poet knew were true, is not the work of a man who held himself above his source, adapting it and remoulding it and inserting new points here and there. It is rather the work of a poet who clung so closely to his source that he did not notice its contradictions, who accepted

¹² Cf. 2295 discussed above, p. 55 and 4117 sqq.

¹³ P. II sqq. Cf. also my article: The Relation of Ebernand von Erfurt to his Sources. Princeton University Bulletin. Vol. XV. No. 1. (1903.) P. 1 sqq.

¹⁴ Cf. my monograph: Ebernand von Erfurt: Zu seinem Leben und Wirken. Jena. 1907. P. 29 sqq.

as gospel everything the source offered. And Ebernand's attitude toward his source was of just this nature. For all these reasons I consider it certain that the lines 2236-50 were based on a corresponding passage in the manuscript of the *Vita Heinrici* which Ebernand used.

The lines 2261-79, the third sub-passages in 2175-2327, contain a speech which Heinrich makes to his nobles as he lies on his deathbed. The speech is not particularly interesting or important in itself, but inasmuch as it is the first and only time that a speech of more than a couple of lines is put into the mouth of a character, quite independently of the *Vita*, it seems altogether improbable that it was wholly original with the poet. It was much more likely drawn from a written source.

In regard to the last sub-passages, 2324-7, I agree with Bresslau¹⁵ that it is much rather to be ascribed to a written source than to the poet's inventiveness. This I think is true because the passage adds exact facts which would be contrary to the poet's usual attitude toward the *Vita Heinrici* as already shown,¹⁶ and because the poet virtually says so, a fact which Bresslau does not mention. Ebernand says, 2314-20: *nû hôt ein frôlich mêre: die erde jâmer machte, der himel vil sêre erlachte; an sîner hinvert stunde wart des ein urkunde, daz von gote eroffent was: ich was frô, dô ich ez las*. Ebernand says explicitly therefore in 2314 and 2320 that he is going to tell a story that he read; this story must be the one contained in the lines 2321-98. To ascribe 2324-7 to the inventiveness of the poet means then that Ebernand inserted new facts in his story just four lines after saying that he had read what he tells. This is so contrary to the poet's usual attitude toward the *Vita Heinrici*, however, that it cannot be assumed. If Ebernand had gone afield for these four lines, just after saying that the story surrounding them was based on a written source, I am convinced that he would have added a line of explanation, accord-

¹⁵Ib. Cf. above, n. 10.

¹⁶Cf. the references given above, n. 13.

ing to his custom.¹⁷ I ascribe 2324-7 therefore, with Bresslau, to the manuscript of the *Vita Heinrici* which Ebernand used.

The frequent deviations of the poem within 2175-2327 from the standard *Vita Heinrici* cannot be ascribed to the inventiveness of Ebernand according to the above argument. Still less can they be charged to the scribe of the manuscript of Ebernand's poem, Lewenhagen.¹⁸ There is no reason to suspect him of interpolation in any other part of the poem, and it is not reasonable to suspect him of several interpolations here, and only here. An additional argument can be drawn from a consideration of the rimes. 2175-2213 and 2236-50 are joined by the rime to the intervening passage which is certainly based on the *Vita Heinrici*, 2261-79 is joined to the following passage in the same way, and 2324-7 is connected on both sides with lines which are based on the usual *Vita*. If it were possible to disconnect the passages which show deviation from the *Vita* from the others, the latter would still make good sense, just as the paragraph in the *Vita* does,¹⁹ but it is impossible to throw out the deviating passages without leaving several rimes hanging in mid-air. Certainly no fault can be found with the flow of the narrative as it stands. The sequence of ideas and events in the whole passage 2175-2327 is indeed so smooth and natural, that Bechstein, the editor of the poem, did not notice the remarkable deviation from the source discussed above. Aside from these considerations there is also no reason to connect Lewenhagen with Merseburg. As far as known, he had no connection with that place, and, therefore, no interest in making such an interpolation as is found in this passage of the poem. The scribe cannot in view of all this be charged with the interpolation of any of these passages.

On the other hand an examination which I have made of the manuscripts of the *Vita Henrici*²⁰ leads me to think that a

¹⁷ Cf. 2295 (and above, p. 55), 4117 sqq. and 2653-6.

¹⁸ On the name and life of the scribe cf. Bechstein, p. VII, and my monograph (cited above, n. 14.), p. 41 sqq.

¹⁹ Cf. above, n. 4.

²⁰ A list of these mss. will appear shortly in the *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*.

manuscript of the *Vita* corresponding to Ebernand's poem may very easily have been in existence at the time Ebernand wrote, though I cannot for lack of space present the necessary argument for the establishment of this opinion. I must content myself with calling attention to a few facts. There are still in existence no less than seven manuscripts of the *Vita Heinrichi* which were written before 1200, that is, before Ebernand wrote his poem.²¹ Of these manuscripts only two contain the whole text of the Monum. pagg. 792-814²² and no two are entirely alike in their contents. In the oldest manuscripts of the *Vita Heinrichi* there is a marked tendency toward amplification and occasional remoulding of sentences and paragraphs.²³

There are many things which indicate that a manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi* which would correspond to Ebernand's poem was probably in the chapter library at Merseburg. The library was established in the eleventh century and was large;²⁴ like other church libraries of the time, it doubtless consisted chiefly or at least in part of manuscripts which dealt with people and affairs connected with the local church. The members of this chapter had reason to remember Heinrich. His name was closely associated with the restoration of Merseburg after the wars with the Poles, he was indeed the prime mover of its restoration according to the *Vita* and Thietmar,²⁵ and he had remembered the

²¹ On the date of the poem cf. Bechstein, p. VI, and my monograph (cited above, n. 14), p. 36 sqq.

²² (a) Bamberg (Königl. Bibliothek): E. III 25 and (b) Klagenfurt (Bibliothek des Geschichtsvereins für Kärnten): Domkapitel Gurk Lade 1 fasz. 1 Nr. 1.

²³ Cf. on the origin and early copies of the *Vita Heinrichi* Monumenta Palaeographica. Herausgegeben von Anton Chroust. Lieferung XXI. Tafel 8. München. 1906, and Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte. Bd. IX. (Göttingen. 1869.) p. 361 sqq. and Bd. X. (Göttingen. 1870.) p. 603 sqq.

²⁴ Cf. Alfred Schmekel: Historisch-topographische Beschreibung des Hochstiftes Merseburg. Halle. Berner. 1858. p. 57.

²⁵ Cf. Monum. 792, 35 sqq. and 793, 47 sqq. and Thietmari Cronicon. Patrol. compl. curs. J.=P. Migne. Series latina. Vol. 139. (Paris. 1880.) col. 1183-1422.

church again and again with benefactions. In the century after his death his memory hardly waned, but a new life must have been given to it in the next century, the twelfth, by the acquirement of various relics of the saint.²⁶ Through the power of these relics, according to the story, many sick people were healed in Merseburg, and the longest list of miracles ascribed to the saint arose there sometime before 1200.²⁷ At this same time that is, in the second half of the twelfth century, the *Vita Heinrichi* was being written and copied in Bamberg.²⁸ Between Bamberg and Merseburg there were strong bonds of connection because of their common interest in Heinrich as shown in the latter's acquirement of relics of the saint. It is fairly certain, therefore, that the *Vita* was known of in Merseburg, and indeed not long after it was first written. It would moreover attract the Merseburg chapter particularly by its repeated references to the church there.²⁹ When Heinrich's part in the restoration and re-founding of Merseburg is recalled, as well as the constant reminder of the saint in the possession and display of his relics, it can be assumed as certain that a copy of this new *Vita* was desired in Merseburg, and it is probable that some effort was made to get one.

Eberhard's poem discloses still other reasons for the assumption of a Merseburg manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi*. The lines 2324-7 tell of a large number of devils who passed a hermit's dwelling just after Heinrich's death, whereas the usual version of the *Vita* speaks of only one devil.³⁰ There is a clue to the indirect source of 2324-7, I think, in Jacobus a Voragine.³¹ Jacobus says in the seventh paragraph of his life of St. Lawrence: *Cum ergo Caesar (sc. Heinrichus) obiisset, multitudo dae-*

²⁶ Cf. Monum. p. 814, a, 39 sqq.

²⁷ Cf. Waitz's Praefatio in the Monum. p. 789, 7 sqq. and p. 814-816.

²⁸ Cf. Monum. Palaeograph. ib. (cited above, n. 23.)

²⁹ Cf. Monum. p. 792, 793, etc.

³⁰ Cf. the Latin above, n. 4.

³¹ Jacobi a Voragine Legenda Aurea. Recensuit Dr. Th. Graesse. Dresdae et Lipsiae. 1846. p. 495.

monum ante cellum cujusdam eremitae transibat, qui aperta fenestra interrogavit ultimum, quinam essent, etc. Where Jacobus got this I cannot say, but he hardly manufactured it. It is reasonable to assume that his source was some *Vita Laurentii*.³² It is easy to see how this *Vita* might contaminate a Merseburg copy of the *Vita Heinrichi*. St. Lawrence was the patron saint of Merseburg³³ and probably the library of the chapter possessed a *Vita Laurentii* which was known by the scribes. Also St. Lawrence was the patron saint only of the Merseburg church among all the churches which Heinrich fostered; consequently an accurate knowledge of the *Vita* of this saint and its contamination of a copy of the *Vita Heinrichi* would be expected there sooner than anywhere else. Furthermore, this story, in which 2324-7 occurs, and its sequel³⁴ form a legend which undoubtedly arose in Merseburg;³⁵ in this legend St. Lawrence figures very conspicuously.³⁶ It must have been known by Merseburg scribes, and an interpolation corresponding to 2324-7 might have been made in a copy of the *Vita Heinrichi* by a scribe who knew only local tradition and did not know the *Vita Laurentii* at all. Considering the relations of St. Lawrence to the Merseburg church and local tradition, it is easy to assume that 2324-7 were based upon a Merseburg manuscript which contained this tradition in all its completeness. It is not easy to assume that this phase of the tradition was in any other kind of a manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi*.

³² Cf. the similar passages in the *Vita Laurentii* as given in the *Acta Sanctorum X. Aug.* (Paris and Rome, 1867), p. 523, par. 16, and p. 526, par. 27.

³³ Cf. *Monum.* p. 793, 21: *Beate Laurenti. . . hunc locum desolatum, tuo nomine consecratum*, etc.

³⁴ Cf. 2321-2492 and *Monum.* p. 810, 36-811, 38.

³⁵ Cf. *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XX, 96.

³⁶ Adalbertus, the author of the *Vita Heinrichi*, must have gotten this legend directly or indirectly from Merseburg. Possibly he got it from some *Vita Laurentii*, just as he got other whole chapters in his *Vita Heinrichi* from other authors, cf. *Monum.* p. 811, a, 44 sqq. and note 32, and 805, 8-13 and note 18; in that case he might have simply omitted the introductory sentence about the large number of devils.

Ebernand says in the course of 2175-2327 that Merseburg was the place where Heinrich on his deathbed commended his wife Kunegunde to the care of his nobles. Besides Ebernand's poem there is at least one other work in which the same statement is made. This work is in a Munich manuscript³⁷ and is entitled: *Opus excerptum ex vulgari chronica de rebus gestis in Germania per Imperatores Rom. et de inclyta civitate alem. Nürenberga*. The paragraph in point reads as follows: *Im XXII Iare Keiser Heinrich als im sein tod vor (ver?) kund ward fodert er die fursten gen Mersburg und uberantrouet in sein gemahel sand Kungund fur ein reine iunckfrou und ordnet Conradten der auch Cono genant was hertzogen zu Francken an das reich. dar nach in dem slos Gruno gab auff sein geist und ward gen Bamberg gefurt und das kelch zu Mersburg die er von dem teufel in sein gericht a geworben*. A comparison of this paragraph with Ebernand's poem shows at once conspicuous variations; there is no mention by Ebernand of Conrad or of the Schloss Grona near Göttingen. Also, the paragraph cited makes it perfectly clear that Merseburg was only the place where Kunegunde was commended to the care of the nobles, not the place of Heinrich's death; whereas Ebernand says explicitly that Merseburg was the scene of both events. There is thus no doubt that the author of the *Opus* wrote quite independently of Ebernand. The sources of the *Opus* are given in the *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*,³⁸ but I found nothing in them that led to the source of the paragraph quoted.³⁹ Scheffer-Boichorst does not include Merseburg in the itinerary of Heinrich's last journey,⁴⁰ the one on which he died, so it could not have been generally

³⁷ Königl. Hof.=und Staatsbibliothek: 472, 4, anno 1500, fol. 166.

³⁸ Bd. III. (*Die Chroniken der fränkischen Städte*. Nürnberg. Bd. III.) Leipzig. Hirzel. 1864. p. 257 sqq.

³⁹The only clue is that *Conradten der auch Cono genant was* probably goes back to Leo of Ostia, cf. *Jahrbücher*, etc., as cited above. n. 10. Bd. III, p. 356, and *Monum. germ. hist.* VII, page 665, n. y and 666, n. c.

⁴⁰ *Kleinere Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. 1. Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Instituts VI, 52-60.

accepted and recorded even as the scene of the address to the nobles. Such a traditional location of this scene would most naturally arise in Merseburg, it would certainly be fostered there, and the author of the *Opus* must have gotten his information from some manuscript which was contaminated by this tradition. His description of this scene, which was based on what he accepted as fact, proves that there was at one time written authority, apart from Ebernand, for locating the scene with the nobles in Merseburg. It may therefore be considered corroborative testimony of the conclusion reached above, namely, that Ebernand used a written source for the passage in point. It presents, furthermore, information that could very naturally have been obtained directly or indirectly from a Merseburg manuscript or Merseburg local tradition, and hardly in any other way. It offers additional reason for assuming that a manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi* corresponding to certain chapters in Ebernand's poem might have been written for Merseburg, and that such a manuscript was written.

If such a manuscript may be assumed to have once existed, the way in which it was written can be easily imagined. Up to the paragraph in question, the one on Heinrich's death, either there is frequent mention of Merseburg in the *Vita*, or events in Heinrich's life are described which occurred in remote districts and concerning which it is fair to assume that an ordinary Merseburg scribe would know nothing. Consequently the *Vita* up to this point would not differ materially from the usual version. In the paragraph telling of Heinrich's death, however," the scribe might first see that this event is described more briefly than any other important event in Heinrich's whole life. He might also see that no place is named as the scene of Heinrich's death, only a mention of the completion of *locum sibi dilectum cum caeteris monasteriis*, that is, Bamberg."² Zealous for an adequate, more comprehensive account of so important an event,

²Cf. above, n. 4.

"Like the author of the *Vita*, Ebernand seems also to imply Bamberg in this connection, cf. 2222 sqq., so I see no reason for suspecting that a Merseburg scribe thought it meant Merseburg and amplified the passage with that as a starting point.

the scribe might easily have remoulded the whole paragraph, introducing it in monkish fashion with a didactic preamble foreshadowing Heinrich's death (=2175-2213), enlarging Heinrich's address to his nobles (=2261-79), and inserting the name of Merseburg as the scene of Heinrich's death implying at the same time, just as Ebernand does, that Merseburg was also the place of Heinrich's burial (=2236-50). This last he might have inserted on the basis of local Merseburg tradition, or because he could feel sure of its acceptance in Merseburg; which, I can not say, as I have not been able to trace it back of Ebernand's poem. In making this reference to Merseburg the scribe might also have referred wrongly to the restoration of this church as the first work of the kind done by Heinrich.

Such a manuscript would most naturally have arisen in Bamberg,⁴³ and the poet might have seen it and copied it there. He might however have seen it and copied it in Merseburg. I am inclined to think that the poem itself was written in Erfurt.⁴⁴ Such a manuscript would in the ordinary course of events have been preserved in Merseburg; there it might have been destroyed later in any one of the many calamities which have befallen that church.⁴⁵ It is not there now, as I have ascertained by correspondence. However, since a list of the miracles which are ascribed to the saint and which arose in Merseburg, has been preserved in several manuscripts,⁴⁶ and since the loca-

⁴³ Beside the reason that the *Vita Heinrichi* was originally written in Bamberg, cf. for an additional argument below, p. 69.

⁴⁴ Cf. my monograph (cited above, n. 14), p. 39 sq.

⁴⁵ Cf. Schmekel (cited above, n. 24) and E. Hoffmann: *Historische Nachrichten aus Alt Merseburg*. Merseburg. Stollberg. 1903.

⁴⁶ (a) Bamberg (Königl. Bibliothek): 121. Q. VI. Pap. 15. Jahrh.; (b) Erlangen (Königl. Universitätsbibliothek): No. 248; (c) Mailingen bei Marktoffingen, Bavaria (Fürstl. Oettingen=Wallerstein'sche Bibliothek): 50 Heinrich II. imp. historia, 1467. II. 1, fol. 192 (1); (d) Munich (Königl. Hof=und Staatsbibliothek): 788 23582 (ZZ. 582) membr. 2. s.XIV. 201 f.; (e) Nuremberg (Stadtbibliothek): Cent. III, 69. The versions of these manuscripts correspond in general to the Monum. p. 814-816; only the first one, (a), has only a portion of the prose concerned (815, b, 54-816, a, 19). Waitz mentions only the second and third, (b) and (c), of these manuscripts, cf. Monum. p. 789.

tion of the scene with the nobles in Merseburg was known in a written form as late as 1500 and as far away as Nuremberg,⁴⁷ possibly a copy of a Merseburg *Vita Heinrici* as here described will still be found.

There is one more passage in which Bechstein suspects contamination in the source, 2025-54.⁴⁸ His footnote on p. 80 strains a point, I think, in asserting that 2023-4: *des mères hât ir gnuoc vernomen, wir muozen an ein ander komen* is based on the Latin:⁴⁹ *ut autem ad superiora redeamus, unde paulisper digressi sumus*. Ebernand announces in his couplet, which ends a chapter, that he is going on to another story, but the author of the Latin says distinctly that he is going to take up an old story again. Besides that, such anticipation of coming events is characteristic of Ebernand, cf. 369, 697, 773, etc. In the following lines, however, there is no connection between the standard version of the *Vita Heinrici*⁵⁰ and 2027-9 or 2032-3. Wherever any connection between the poem and the *Vita* can be shown at all, there is not the slightest evidence of Ebernand's misunderstanding the Latin; consequently, as Bechstein says, it is not to be assumed that Ebernand's mention of the coronation is intended as the equivalent of the Latin: *confirmatus apostolica benedictione*. There is also no connection between the Latin and 2038-48, and in these lines Ebernand says expressly: *ez saget die krôneke noch fur wâr*. Furthermore, according to 2054 Heinrich left his army in Cluny, but in the Latin he sends it to Germany. And there is no mention of the

⁴⁷On the time and place at which the *Opus* was written cf. the *Chroniken der deutschen Städte* as cited above, n. 38.

⁴⁸P. II. Bechstein says, "V. 1014," but he must mean 2032 as that is the only line in which Ebernand refers to Heinrich's coronation. Probably Bechstein had the date of the coronation (1014) in mind instead of the line in question.

⁴⁹Monum. p. 809, 41.

⁵⁰The full text of the Monum. (p. 809, 41-44) involved here is as follows: *Ut autem ad superiora redeamus, unde paulisper digressi sumus, postquam vir sanctus Romae positus, omnia quae petebat a domno papa impetravit, confirmatus apostolica benedictione, Alpes Appenninas transcendit et dimisso exercitu in terram suam, Cluniacum . . . perrexit.*

Alps and Apennines in the poem. This passage 2025-54 seems to me to be based beyond doubt on a contaminated source. Before it and after it Ebernand clings closely to the *Vita Heinrici* as we have it in the Monum., but the manuscripts of the *Vita* differ considerably from each other in the way in which they present this sentence. A Munich⁵¹ and a Vienna⁵² manuscript begin the paragraph in point as follows: *Inde tunc iter faciens Romam pervenit ubi a Benedicto papa honorifice susceptus est. Confirmatus*, etc.; a Basel⁵³ manuscript begins it: *Nunc iterum ad superiora redeamus, unde paulisper privilegium interserere digressi sumus*, etc.; a Gotha⁵⁴ and a Zwickau⁵⁵ manuscript begin it: *Vir ergo sanctus postquam omnia quae*, etc. The sentence as it is in the Monum. has still another form so that there are now four versions of the beginning of this paragraph, and there were three of these at least at the beginning of the thirteenth century when Ebernand wrote his poem. There is therefore decidedly less reason to think that Ebernand would break his rule of omitting nothing and adding nothing, only to return to it as conscientiously as ever, than there is to think that the scribe of a manuscript of the *Vita* would do so. A contaminated source whose meaning was not clear, and a close adherence to it afford also the most natural explanation for the strange disconnected succession of ideas and events in 2025-54. If it had been a question of Ebernand's interpolation of the contents of this passage, without any reference to the copy of the *Vita* he was using, he would have thought them out beforehand and would have written the passage accordingly; he is not a gifted storyteller, but there is no such jumble anywhere else in the poem. It cannot be denied that carelessness on the part of Lewenhagen⁵⁶ may be responsible for some of the confusion in this

⁵¹ Königl. Hof.- und Staatsbibliothek: 758 12635 (Ranshofen 35) s. XIII et XIV.

⁵² Königl.-Kaiserl. Hofbibliothek: CCVI. $\frac{289}{s. 8n.}$ saec. XII.

⁵³ Universitätsbibliothek: F. P. VII. 16.

⁵⁴ Herzogl. Bibliothek: Cod. membr. I 64. saec. XIV.

⁵⁵ Ratsschulbibliothek: B Nr. LXVI. saec. XVII.

⁵⁶ Cf. above, p. 60.

passage. He is hardly responsible for it all, however, as a tendency to such gross carelessness is not discoverable anywhere else in his manuscript and he is certainly not to be charged with the interpolation of the main content of the passage, namely, the mention of the coronation.

Several authors, who wrote before Ebernand, mention or describe Heinrich's coronation,⁸⁷ but for various reasons which can not be given in detail here, none of the known writers on this subject can be accepted as Ebernand's direct source for this passage. The most cogent reason for rejecting these writers as a source is that the evidence to be drawn from a comparison of the poem with the standard *Vita Heinrichi* indicates with reasonable certainty that Ebernand used only one manuscript, not that he gathered points for his story from many different sources and fitted them together into an harmonious whole. Nonosius, a German author of the sixteenth century, who deals with the life of Heinrich quite independently of Ebernand and who follows his source closely,⁸⁸ mentions the coronation of Heinrich in just the same place in his story that Ebernand does in his, and in the same brief way. He is, therefore, fairly reliable evidence of the sometime mention of Heinrich's coronation in manuscripts of the *Vita Heinrichi* in a way which would satisfy the conditions presented in Ebernand's poem. Nonosius was a sacristan in Bamberg and, whatever manuscript of the *Vita Heinrichi* was his source,⁸⁹ he probably obtained it in his place of residence. This probability furnishes additional reason for thinking that such a Merseburg manuscript as outlined above would have arisen in Bamberg.⁹⁰

Besides these passages there are three brief historical refer-

⁸⁷ Cf. *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II.* Bd. II. (Berlin. Duncker und Humblot. 1864.) p. 425.

⁸⁸Nonosius: *Dye legent vnd leben des heyligē sandt Keyser Heinrichs.* Bamberg. Pfeyll. 1511. Cf. on Nonosius's work my monograph (cited above, n. 14), p. 86 sqq. and p. 73 sqq. Nonosius mentions the coronation Bogen E.

⁸⁹ Cf. my monograph (cited above, n. 14), p. 99.

⁹⁰Cf. above, p. 66.

ences in the poem which also indicate Ebernand's use of a version of the *Vita Heinrici*, which differed from the one followed in the Monum. In the lines 142-3 Ebernand says that the body of Otto the Child was taken to Aix-la-Chapelle and buried there; in 157-8 he says *die schrift*, that is, his source, named the founders of Rome to him: *Rêmus unde Rômulus*; and in 1009-13 he derives *Babenberc* (Bamberg) from the name of the sister of Heinrich I., Babe. Bechstein thinks that the last two references were added by the poet from his general knowledge;⁶¹ Bresslau ascribes the last one to a written source.⁶² Neither Bechstein nor Bresslau remarks on the deviation from the *Vita* in the lines 142-3. The derivation of the name *Babenberc* Ebernand may have read in various places,⁶³ but he may also have heard it as a local popular etymology when he was in Bamberg. The other two references I think must be ascribed to the manuscript of the *Vita* which Ebernand used. The first one occurs only a half-dozen lines after an explicit reference to his source, and the second one is introduced by such a reference; and very soon after, 162-3, the poet half apologizes for the details he gives, with the words: *swaz ich vor mir geschriben sê, ich lâze ez ungerne*⁶⁴ *underwegen*.

This completes my consideration of the relation of Ebernand's poem to the *Vita Heinrici* and of the probable character of the manuscript of the *Vita* which the poet used. For the reasons given above I believe that he used a manuscript which was contaminated in various places, notably in those corresponding to lines 2025-54 and 2175-2327. I am inclined to think that it was a manuscript written for the church at Merseburg, and that it is permanently lost. He certainly did not use one of the now existing and known manuscripts of the *Vita*, as I

⁶¹ P. II.

⁶² Cf. Jahrbücher, etc. (cited above, n. 10), Bd. III. p. 369.

⁶³ Cf. the list of works from which this might have been taken, Jahrbücher, etc. (cited above, n. 57) Bd. II. p. 17.

⁶⁴ Bechstein's reading *gerne* is contrary to the manuscript of the poem; cf. his Nachtrag, p. 206.

have ascertained either by a personal examination of them or through reliable information concerning their contents.

For other parts of the poem Ebernand used beyond doubt a practically exact copy of the *Vita Cunegundis*,⁶⁵ according with Bechstein's table.⁶⁶ He did not to my mind use the *Additamentum* in the present version of the Monum.⁶⁷ but an older shorter version; this, however, requires a lengthy exposition and must be left until a later time.

In addition to these three sources, two of which seem to be lost, Ebernand also used the papal bull authorizing Kunegunde's canonization. This Bechstein does not consider at all. Ebernand says 4105-7: *sô man der rede* (that is, of Kunegunde's canonization) *begunde, volgên ez* (that is, her canonization) *niht enkunde: diz mac man an ir buochen lesen*. The bull must be meant in 4107, because that is the only place where Ebernand could read of the delay in Kunegunde's canonization, through the death of Pope Coelestin.⁶⁸ Other indications of the poet's use or knowledge of the bull can be found in a number of lines. 4285-9, although formal and Scriptural in character, sound very much like a translation of *caeci visum, claudi gressum, muti verbum et surdi recuperaverunt auditum*.⁶⁹ The assurance in 4290-3 that a great many miracles took place at the tomb of Kunegunde (4292: *alse mir die schrift verjach*) may be copied from the bull's emphasis on the large number of these miracles, but *die schrift* may refer to the usual list of miracles ascribed to the saint.⁷⁰ 4323 is at least proof of Ebernand's knowledge of the bull: *er* (that is, the pope) *gab in* (that is, the Bamberg prelates) *hantveste guot*. And lastly, the description of the journey of the same prelates to Rome 4308 sqq. seems to follow the bull par. 4 as its source. Ebernand doubtless saw the original bull when he was in Bamberg and perhaps he

⁶⁵Monum. directly after the *Vita Heinrichi*, p. 821-824.

⁶⁶Cf. p. IV.

⁶⁷Monum. p. 816-820.

⁶⁸Cf. the bull in the *Acta Sanctorum* III, Mart. p. 281 sq.

⁶⁹*Acta Sanct.* ib. par. 7.

⁷⁰Monum. p. 825 sqq.

copied it there. The bull is not contained in any of the present manuscripts of the *Vita Cunegundis* which were written before the poem.

GEO. M. PRIEST.

Princeton, New Jersey.